DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 617 HE 004 622

AUTHOR	Dutton, Jeffrey E.; Jenkins, Martin D.
TITLE	The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities. Report, Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, Survey No. 15.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Higher Education Panel.
PUB DATE	24 Aug 73
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Higher Education; Research Projects; *School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; *Urban Areas; *Urban Extension

ABSTRACT

This survey examined urban involvement of colleges and universities across the United States. A questionnaire was sent to 519 Higher Education panel member institutions, a 20% sample of the relevant population. Usable returns were received from 83.6% of the sample. Results indicated colleges and universities across the U.S. have been fairly active in urban affairs. These activities have not been free of the problems of financial support and size or location of the institution. Approximately 34% of these institutions had encountered major problems in trying to define what aspects of urban involvement were appropriate for their institution. The availability of competent staff and the lack of institutional incentives for faculty involvement also generated major problems at a large proportion of institutions. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082617

Higher Education Panel

Report

American Council on Education

Survey No. 15

August 24, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities

Jeffrey E. Dutton
Martin D. Jenkins

In February 1973, the Office of Urban Affairs of the American Council on Education requested the Higher Education Panel to conduct a survey on the urban involvement of colleges and universities across the United States. Although the survey was specifically related to the interests of the Office of Urban Affairs, the more general concerns of the total higher education community were given major emphasis.

Later in the month, the survey form shown in Appendix B was mailed to 519 representatives of the Higher Education Panel's member institutions, a 20 percent sample of the relevant population. (See Appendix A for a description of the sampling and weighting procedures.) Usable returns were received from 83.6 percent (434 institutions) of the sample.

For purposes of this survey, the term urban comprises both the central city and the adjacent suburbs. Urban involvement refers to institutional activities through instruction, student services, research projects, and community service activities, in such areas as criminal justice, housing, urban planning, health services, and through the provision of educational opportunities to students from urban areas.

HE 004 622

The authors are indebted to John A. Creager and Joan Trexler for assisting in the preparation of this report and to Laura Kent for her editorial review.

The data collected in this survey are reported for nine categories (overlapping) of institutions: universities, four-year colleges, two-year colleges, all public institutions, all private institutions, all institutions located in an SMSA-central city, all institutions located in an SMSA-fringe area, all institutions in a non-SMSA area, and a total for all institutions. The census definition of an SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) was used. The SMSA status of an institution was determined by its location and by the U.S. Census Bureau's classification of that location. Tables 1 and 2 detail the distributions of institutions within these classifications for the population and sample, respectively.

This report contains two sets of tables: the first is based on all the sample institutions regardless of their current or anticipated urban involvement. Although some questionnaire items were omitted by those institutions that had not been involved in urban affairs and did not anticipate any such involvement in the next five years, a few have been included in the first set of tables, the criterion being the content of the items. Those included were judged to be relevant to the population of institutions: i.e., Does your institution currently offer an undergraduate degree in urban affairs? The responses of institutions instructed to omit these items were coded as "not currently true" and "not anticipated."

The second set of tables is based on the responses from only those institutions that were, or anticipate being, involved in urban affairs.

DISCUSSION

Urban involvement was regarded as a major function of American higher education by 72 percent of all higher education institutions. Considerably fewer (31 percent) viewed urban involvement as a major function of their institution. Only .5 percent felt that urban involvement was an inappropriate function for American higher education, while approximately 20 percent regarded it as an inappropriate function for their institution.

Proportionally fewer four-year colleges (as opposed to universities and two-year colleges) thought that urban involvement was a major function of American higher education. Similarly, fewer private than public institutions, and fewer institutions located in the central city or a fringe area than non-SMSA institutions, held this view. The same relations were found for the various institutional categories with respect to their own involvement in urban affairs, with one exception: As proximity to an urban center increases, so does the proportion reporting that urban involvement was a major function for their institution.

Panel members were asked to indicate which of a wide variety of programs and activities relating to their possible urban involvement were either currently in progress or anticipated (Table 3). The responses were coded so that institutions responding "currently true" were mutually exclusive of those responding "anticipated." Thus, by adding the percentage responding "currently true" and the percentage responding anticipated, we can get an indication of the percentage of all institutions that would check "currently true," if they were responding to the items in 1978. This interpretation should, however, be regarded with caution since some of the institutions that now have these programs may drop them in the next five years.

The above-mentioned items tap different types of urban involvement, ranging from formal instruction in urban affairs and student services through structural and financial components of existing or anticipated programs. Since the list of items and the reporting categories are numerous, only a general description of the entire range of items will be given here. The interested reader may interpret for himself more specific relations.

A positive response to any of these items reflects, to some degree, affirmative action on the part of the institution in the particular area of urban involvement. The proportion of universities responding "currently true" substantially exceeds the proportion of all institutions for each of the items. The four-year institutions also exceed or equal the normative estimates, however the differences between four-year college estimates and all institution estimates are not as substantial. The two-year colleges, however, fall below the normative estimates in all cases.

As one might expect, a greater proportion of those institutions located in SMSA-central cities said that they were now engaged in the various aspects of urban affairs. In fact, as the distance of the institution from the urban center increased, the proportion of institutions responding "currently true" to each item decreased. Public institutions, with few exceptions, reported a more extensive and deeper involvement than did private institutions. The exceptions were in the area of educational programs. That is, a smaller proportion of public institutions than of private offered structured urban affairs programs, undergraduate degrees in urban affairs, internships, and cooperative urban programs.

Table 4 presents the same data for only those institutions which were, or anticipated being, involved in urban affairs.

Although the proportion of institutions regarding urban ivolvement as a major function for American higher education was increased by only 1 percent, the proportion regarding it as a major function for their institution increased by 10 percent (all institutions, 31 percent; institutions reporting urban involvement, 41 percent). None of the institutions which were involved in urban affairs regarded this involvement as an inappropriate function for American higher education and only .8 percent said that it is inappropriate for their institution.

As expected, the proportion of institutions giving positive responses to the "currently true" items increased substantially over that reported for all institutions; the breakout by type of institution, however, was not as consistent as that found for all institutions. As was noted in Table 3, for all institutions, the proportion of universities exceeded the proportion of four-year colleges, which, in turn, exceeded the proportion of two-year colleges for each of the statements. But in the case of only those institutions reporting urban involvement, on a number of items, a higher proportion of two-year colleges than of four-year colleges indicated that they were active in certain areas, all of them dealing with student services or financial support for urban activities.

Institutions located in the central city reported proportionally more urban activities than did institutions located in the fringe or the non-SMSA areas. The institutions located in the fringe areas generally reported more urban involvement than did those in the non-SMSA areas, except in the areas of self-study and student training.

Contrary to the relation between public and private institutions noted in Table 3, public institutions reporting urban involvement currently

were proportionally more active in urban affairs. For only two items (instruction and research projects related to urban involvement) did private institutions report more activity.

Table 4 also presents a list of possible problems; respondents from those institutions reporting urban involvement were asked to indicate their severity: major problem, minor problem, and no problem.

Of all institutions involved in urban activities, 66 percent reported that financial support was a major problem. Thirty-six percent cited as a major problem restrictions imposed by the size or location of the institution.

Approximately 34 percent of these institutions had encountered major problems in trying to define what aspects of urban involvement were appropriate for their institution. The availability of competent staff and the lack of institutional incentives for faculty involvement also generated major problems at a large proportion of institutions. (23 percent and 25 percent, respectively).

To summarize, colleges and universities across the U.S. have been fairly active in urban affairs. These activities have not been free of problems; and, in a number of instances, some of these problems have been of major concern to a high proportion of institutions. The future of American higher education involvement in urban activities does, however, look promising.

Table 1

Distribution of the Population of Institutions by Type, Location, and Control

Type of Institution	Location of Institution									All Institutions		
	Central City			Fringe Area			Non-SMSA					
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
University	59	50	109	17	13	30	43	4	47	119	67	186
Four-Year	130	420	550	55	224	279	191	326	517	376	970	1346
Two-Year	226	85	311	177	48	225	411	93	504	814	226	1040
Total	415	555	970	249	285	534	645	423	1068	1309	1263	2572

Table 2

Distribution of the Sample of Institutions by Type, Location, and Control

Type of Institution	Location of Institution									All Institutions		
	Central City			Fringe Area			Non-SMSA					
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
University	17	18	35	5	6	11	9	1	10	31	25	56
Four-Year	14	81	95	12	62	74	33	94	127	59	237	296
Two-Year	17	5	22	7	6	13	29	18	47	53	29	82
Total	48	104	152	24	74	98	71	113	184	143	291	434

Table 3
Responses on Urban Involvement of All Institutions

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Do you regard urban involvement as:									
A major function									
for American higher education	71.8	80.0	66.4	77.7	70.1	68.8	74.8	81.8	61.6
for your institution	30.7	48.9	28.3	30.5	56.0	22.9	10.7	37.3	23.7
A minor function									
for American higher education	27.7	20.0	32.7	22.3	29.9	31.2	24.0	17.7	37.8
for your institution	49.5	47.2	58.8	37.1	41.3	58.2	52.8	37.1	62.6
An inappropriate function									
for American higher education	.5	.0	.9	.0	.0	.0	1.2	.4	.6
for your institution	19.9	4.0	12.8	32.4	2.7	18.9	36.5	25.6	13.7
Direction of institutional urban involvement:									
Past five years:									
Substantial increase	23.9	34.9	23.2	22.4	31.8	25.0	15.6	27.0	20.5
Some increase	42.5	55.9	53.3	24.7	55.3	43.1	29.9	31.4	54.2
About the same	33.4	9.1	22.9	52.9	12.9	31.9	53.8	41.6	24.7
Decrease	.3	.0	.5	.0	.0	.0	.7	.0	.6
Next five years:									
Substantial increase	19.5	25.3	22.2	14.3	29.6	24.4	7.0	20.2	18.8
Some increase	46.2	62.9	46.9	41.4	55.6	42.1	39.0	41.5	50.8
About the same	34.0	11.8	30.2	44.3	14.3	32.9	54.0	38.2	29.7
Decrease	.3	.0	.6	.0	.6	.6	.0	.0	.7
Some aspects of the following are specifically related to your institution's urban involvement:									
Instruction									
Currently true	55.5	81.5	63.2	41.0	77.6	54.5	36.0	50.3	61.0
Anticipated	5.3	6.0	6.0	4.2	7.0	8.7	2.0	4.7	5.9
Student services									
Currently true	44.4	58.5	50.0	34.7	71.1	36.2	24.2	42.3	46.0
Anticipated	5.2	12.9	4.9	4.2	6.1	7.4	3.3	6.4	4.0
Research projects									
Currently true	36.1	83.3	45.3	15.8	53.0	34.8	21.4	32.1	40.3
Anticipated	10.0	9.4	10.0	10.2	14.4	13.7	4.2	12.2	7.8
Community service activities									
Currently true	55.5	85.6	60.1	44.2	81.4	53.5	32.9	51.6	59.5
Anticipated	6.6	5.6	8.6	4.3	5.7	8.8	6.4	6.6	6.7

Table 3 -- Continued

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Area	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Presidential leadership in urban involvement									
Currently true	35.9	48.1	36.1	33.4	54.4	32.1	20.9	36.7	35.0
Anticipated	10.9	10.4	13.3	8.0	15.8	12.0	6.0	12.1	9.7
Formally structured urban affairs program									
Currently true	15.8	36.1	20.1	6.6	24.8	14.5	8.3	15.7	16.0
Anticipated	14.5	15.0	19.2	8.3	17.6	18.6	9.6	14.3	14.7
Offer undergraduate degree in urban affairs									
Currently true	7.5	16.8	10.0	2.7	9.7	7.2	5.7	7.0	8.1
Anticipated	10.4	22.7	13.9	3.8	14.7	14.3	4.7	13.9	6.9
Offer graduate degree in urban affairs									
Currently true	4.5	27.2	4.9	.0	8.2	2.8	2.0	5.8	3.1
Anticipated	4.7	14.6	7.0	.0	10.3	2.1	1.0	8.5	.8
Formal institutional self-study conducted as a basis for urban involvement									
Currently true	9.1	23.1	9.3	6.4	15.4	4.5	5.8	10.7	7.5
Anticipated	9.3	13.1	11.0	6.5	15.5	6.1	5.2	11.1	7.5
Preparation of an inventory of institution's urban involvement									
Currently true	8.4	25.8	8.2	5.6	14.3	5.6	4.6	10.2	6.7
Anticipated	18.5	24.2	19.7	15.8	27.4	18.0	10.6	18.7	18.2
Establishment of an urban center or institute									
Currently true	10.1	41.7	11.5	2.6	14.7	9.1	6.4	12.4	7.7
Anticipated	9.5	6.8	11.8	7.0	15.3	15.1	1.4	10.9	8.0
Establishment of an urban affairs committee									
Currently true	14.3	36.0	16.5	7.6	21.6	18.5	5.7	16.7	11.9
Anticipated	12.3	20.4	12.2	10.9	19.9	13.3	4.9	10.4	14.3
Programs providing credit for internships or other community participation									
Currently true	38.3	65.4	47.6	21.4	55.7	34.9	24.1	35.4	41.3
Anticipated	15.3	12.0	15.3	15.9	16.2	26.3	9.0	13.6	17.0

Table 3 -- Concluded

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Institutional funds specifically budgeted for urban involvement									
Currently true	25.2	56.9	24.0	21.0	35.9	24.4	15.8	26.7	23.6
Anticipated	10.3	8.6	14.0	5.8	16.5	11.1	4.3	11.2	9.4
Cooperative urban programs conducted with other institutions/organizations									
Currently true	33.3	44.3	34.9	29.4	46.5	34.8	20.6	32.9	33.7
Anticipated	15.5	21.6	19.2	9.8	22.6	18.8	7.5	12.9	18.2
Specifically designated officer coordinating urban activities									
Currently true	17.0	45.8	17.1	11.7	22.8	18.1	11.1	19.0	14.9
Anticipated	11.3	3.0	15.4	7.4	18.4	13.8	3.6	11.9	10.6
Specifically designated officer serving as liason with city officials									
Currently true	13.6	37.3	15.6	6.8	24.1	13.6	4.2	15.5	11.7
Anticipated	10.2	9.7	10.8	9.6	17.6	9.7	3.8	11.6	8.8
One or more Federal grants supporting urban activities									
Currently true	26.3	65.7	26.1	19.4	38.0	23.8	16.8	34.6	17.6
Anticipated	10.3	12.7	10.9	9.2	16.5	10.2	4.7	8.6	12.0
One or more foundation grants supporting urban activities									
Currently true	13.0	39.7	16.4	3.9	21.7	12.2	5.5	12.8	13.3
Anticipated	14.3	22.7	14.0	13.1	22.8	16.5	5.4	16.6	11.8
Services to minority students constitute an aspect of urban involvement									
Currently true	43.0	63.0	47.2	34.1	69.7	39.9	20.4	42.5	43.6
Anticipated	7.1	8.2	6.9	7.2	9.0	9.8	4.1	7.3	7.0

Table 4

Responses on Urban Involvement of Institutions with Current or Anticipated Activities

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Do you regard urban involvement as:									
A major function									
for American higher education	72.8	82.8	68.3	78.2	70.2	66.1	82.4	82.6	64.7
for your institution	41.3	53.7	34.7	49.8	58.2	30.6	18.8	56.4	28.1
A minor function									
for American higher education	27.2	17.2	31.7	21.8	29.8	33.9	17.6	17.4	35.3
for your institution	57.9	46.3	63.9	50.2	41.8	69.4	78.4	43.6	70.3
An inappropriate function									
for American higher education	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
for your institution	.8	.0	1.4	.0	.0	.0	2.9	.0	1.5
Direction of institutional urban involvement:									
Past five years:									
Substantial increase	31.7	38.5	28.2	36.0	32.9	31.8	29.5	40.0	24.6
Some increase	52.9	58.6	60.7	37.4	56.7	50.1	48.6	43.8	61.0
About the same	15.0	3.0	10.5	26.5	10.4	18.1	20.5	16.2	13.7
Decrease	.4	.0	.7	.0	.0	.0	1.4	.0	.7
Next five years:									
Substantial increase	26.0	27.8	27.4	22.5	30.6	29.1	14.2	31.0	21.9
Some increase	55.7	66.3	53.1	57.4	56.9	49.7	58.2	54.4	56.8
About the same	17.9	5.9	18.7	20.1	11.8	20.3	27.6	14.6	20.5
Decrease	.5	.0	.8	.0	.6	.8	.0	.0	.8
Some aspects of the following are specifically related to your institution's urban involvement:									
Instruction									
Currently true	78.7	89.4	80.0	73.2	83.0	74.9	73.9	78.2	79.1
Anticipated	7.5	6.5	7.6	7.4	7.5	11.9	4.0	7.2	7.6
Student services									
Currently true	62.8	64.1	63.1	61.9	76.0	49.9	49.6	66.5	59.6
Anticipated	7.4	16.1	6.2	7.4	6.5	10.1	6.7	10.0	5.1
Research projects									
Currently true	51.2	91.7	57.3	28.2	56.8	47.8	43.9	49.9	52.3
Anticipated	14.2	10.0	12.6	18.2	15.4	18.9	8.4	18.9	10.1
Community service activities									
Currently true	78.6	94.1	76.1	78.9	87.1	73.8	67.5	80.2	77.3
Anticipated	9.3	5.9	10.8	7.6	6.1	11.9	13.0	10.2	8.6

Table 4 --Continued

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Area	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Presidential leadership in urban involvement									
Currently true	50.8	52.9	45.6	59.6	58.2	44.2	42.8	57.1	45.4
Anticipated	15.4	11.2	16.8	14.2	16.8	16.3	12.3	18.7	12.6
Formally structured urban affairs program									
Currently true	22.4	39.4	25.4	11.7	26.5	19.9	17.0	24.3	20.7
Anticipated	20.5	16.5	24.2	14.8	18.8	25.6	19.5	22.1	19.1
Offer undergraduate degree in urban affairs									
Currently true	10.7	18.2	12.6	4.8	10.4	9.8	11.7	10.9	10.5
Anticipated	14.8	24.7	17.6	6.7	15.6	19.6	9.6	21.6	8.9
Offer graduate degree in urban affairs									
Currently true	6.4	29.6	6.1	.0	8.8	3.6	4.0	9.0	4.0
Anticipated	6.7	15.9	8.8	.0	10.9	2.8	1.9	13.2	1.0
Formal institutional self-study conducted as a basis for urban involvement									
Currently true	12.9	25.3	11.7	11.3	16.4	6.2	11.9	16.6	9.7
Anticipated	13.1	14.1	13.8	11.5	16.5	8.3	10.7	17.2	9.6
Preparation of an inventory of institution's urban involvement									
Currently true	12.0	28.2	10.3	10.0	15.2	7.5	9.4	15.8	8.6
Anticipated	26.1	26.5	24.9	28.2	29.3	24.8	21.6	29.1	23.6
Establishment of an urban center or institute									
Currently true	14.3	45.9	14.5	4.6	15.7	12.4	13.0	19.2	9.9
Anticipated	13.4	7.1	14.8	12.5	16.3	20.7	2.9	17.0	10.4
Establishment of an urban affairs committee									
Currently true	20.3	39.4	20.8	13.6	23.1	25.4	11.5	25.9	15.4
Anticipated	17.4	22.4	15.5	19.4	21.3	18.1	10.0	16.0	18.5
Programs providing credit for internships or other community participation									
Currently true	54.2	71.8	60.2	38.1	59.6	48.1	49.4	55.0	53.5
Anticipated	21.7	12.9	19.3	28.4	17.3	36.3	18.4	21.1	22.1

Table 4 -- Continued

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Institutional funds specifically budgeted for urban involvement									
Currently true	35.6	62.4	30.3	37.5	38.4	33.6	32.3	41.6	30.6
Anticipated	14.6	9.4	17.7	10.3	17.6	15.2	8.6	17.3	12.1
Cooperative urban programs conducted with other institutions/organizations									
Currently true	47.2	48.5	44.1	52.4	49.8	47.8	42.3	51.2	43.7
Anticipated	22.0	23.5	24.2	17.4	24.1	25.8	15.3	20.1	23.7
Specifically designated officer coordinating urban activities									
Currently true	24.1	50.0	21.6	20.9	24.4	24.9	22.8	29.5	19.4
Anticipated	15.9	2.9	19.5	13.1	19.6	18.9	7.3	18.5	13.7
Specifically designated officer serving as liason with city officials									
Currently true	19.3	41.2	19.7	12.2	25.8	18.6	8.4	24.1	15.1
Anticipated	14.5	10.6	13.6	17.2	18.7	13.2	7.8	17.9	11.4
One or more Federal grants supporting urban activities									
Currently true	37.2	72.4	33.0	34.7	40.6	32.8	34.5	53.9	22.8
Anticipated	14.6	13.5	13.7	16.3	17.6	14.0	9.6	13.4	15.6
One or more foundation grants supporting urban activities									
Currently true	18.5	43.5	20.7	6.9	23.2	16.8	11.3	19.8	17.2
Anticipated	20.2	24.7	17.7	23.2	24.3	22.7	10.9	25.8	15.3
Services to minority students constitute an aspect of urban involvement									
Currently true	61.0	69.4	59.7	60.9	74.7	55.0	41.8	66.2	56.6
Anticipated	10.1	8.8	8.7	12.9	9.6	13.4	8.2	11.3	9.0

Table 4 -- Continued

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Severity of possible problems encountered in urban involvement:									
Administrative organization									
Major problem	13.7	23.7	13.0	11.4	15.8	9.0	12.4	13.8	13.4
Minor problem	34.6	39.6	37.2	28.3	38.2	35.8	26.4	36.5	33.0
No problem	51.7	36.7	49.7	60.3	46.0	55.2	61.2	49.7	53.6
Availability of competent faculty and staff									
Major problem	22.7	29.9	25.0	16.2	24.0	17.8	24.1	20.7	24.6
Minor problem	41.5	46.5	44.7	34.1	43.3	34.4	43.7	37.8	44.8
No problem	35.8	23.6	30.3	49.7	32.8	47.7	32.3	41.5	30.6
Defining appropriate aspects of urban involvement									
Major problem	33.6	32.3	29.0	43.1	32.4	31.1	38.4	39.6	28.5
Minor problem	48.4	50.3	50.0	44.8	45.7	51.7	51.5	46.2	50.3
No problem	17.9	17.4	21.0	12.1	21.9	17.2	10.1	14.2	21.2
Development of cooperative relations with other institutions									
Major problem	10.3	16.3	14.4	1.6	8.7	11.4	12.4	6.1	14.3
Minor problem	45.8	52.9	47.7	40.5	49.5	30.4	50.8	45.7	45.9
No problem	43.9	30.7	37.9	57.9	41.9	58.2	36.8	48.2	39.8
Development of relations with city officials									
Major problem	7.9	12.0	8.5	5.5	9.5	4.4	7.7	7.5	8.3
Minor problem	38.2	40.7	41.7	31.6	38.4	38.1	37.6	32.8	43.5
No problem	53.9	47.3	49.9	62.8	52.1	57.5	54.7	59.6	48.2
Faculty acceptance of urban involvement as institutional objective									
Major problem	18.3	25.0	21.0	10.8	18.6	14.1	21.2	15.3	21.0
Minor problem	49.7	46.2	41.4	66.9	46.0	64.4	45.0	55.6	44.4
No problem	32.0	28.7	37.6	22.3	35.4	21.6	33.7	29.2	34.6
Financial support for urban involvement activities									
Major problem	66.5	61.5	71.9	58.3	69.5	63.6	63.6	66.5	66.6
Minor problem	21.9	26.7	19.5	24.8	15.5	25.7	30.8	23.2	20.7
No problem	11.6	11.8	8.6	16.9	15.0	10.7	5.6	10.3	12.7
Relating to the community or neighborhood									
Major problem	9.7	22.4	10.6	3.9	10.1	5.6	12.3	9.4	9.9
Minor problem	51.6	52.0	48.2	57.6	56.1	49.2	44.1	50.4	52.6
No problem	38.7	25.7	41.2	38.5	33.8	45.2	43.6	40.2	37.5

Table 4 -- Concluded

	All Institutions	Type of Institution			Location of Institution			Control of Institution	
		Universities	Four-year Colleges	Two-year Colleges	Central City	Fringe Areas	Non-SMSA	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Lack of institutional incentives for faculty involvement									
Major problem	24.9	36.6	26.5	18.2	26.7	12.2	32.5	25.4	24.6
Minor problem	49.3	49.7	44.2	58.7	46.3	66.1	40.5	54.3	45.2
No problem	25.8	13.7	29.3	23.1	27.0	21.7	26.9	20.3	30.2
Lack of interdisciplinary cooperation									
Major problem	8.4	8.7	10.3	4.2	9.1	5.9	8.9	8.3	8.4
Minor problem	46.9	57.8	44.1	48.6	48.8	40.8	48.5	47.8	46.2
No problem	44.7	33.5	45.6	47.2	42.1	53.3	42.6	44.0	45.4
Lack of information about urban programs at other institutions									
Major problem	7.1	1.9	9.2	4.8	6.0	6.6	9.7	5.6	8.4
Minor problem	47.0	45.3	39.8	61.1	44.0	41.0	58.6	45.9	48.1
No problem	45.9	52.8	50.9	34.1	50.0	52.4	31.7	48.5	43.5
Lack of information about Federal and foundation funding programs									
Major problem	26.5	16.2	25.5	32.2	21.6	31.5	31.3	29.9	23.5
Minor problem	44.2	55.8	45.4	37.7	45.8	42.6	42.4	38.5	49.2
No problem	29.3	27.9	29.1	30.1	32.6	25.9	26.3	31.6	27.2
Politicalization									
Major problem	13.2	21.8	13.3	10.4	18.8	6.5	8.1	16.1	10.7
Minor problem	41.5	35.4	37.5	50.7	35.9	59.3	36.8	39.7	43.2
No problem	45.2	42.9	49.2	39.0	45.3	34.3	55.1	44.2	46.2
Relating to educationally disadvantaged students									
Major problem	14.8	16.6	12.0	18.7	15.8	17.2	10.5	20.3	9.4
Minor problem	48.2	52.2	47.8	47.7	44.8	55.7	49.0	38.6	57.3
No problem	37.0	31.2	40.1	33.6	39.4	27.1	40.5	41.1	33.3
Relating to minority students or communities									
Major problem	17.4	21.1	19.3	13.0	17.1	19.8	15.6	20.3	14.5
Minor problem	50.0	44.7	45.1	59.7	43.4	64.7	51.1	43.9	55.7
No problem	32.7	34.2	35.6	27.3	39.5	15.6	33.3	35.7	29.8
Restrictions imposed by size or location of institution									
Major problem	36.5	21.3	39.9	35.3	21.1	37.0	65.6	25.8	46.0
Minor problem	29.3	27.7	31.0	27.2	31.7	34.8	20.1	31.8	27.2
No problem	34.2	51.0	29.1	37.5	47.2	28.2	14.3	42.3	26.9

Appendix A

The eligible population for this survey consisted of 2,572 institutions of higher education. Data on the urban involvement of colleges and universities were solicited by mail from 519 institutions (20.1 percent of the population) participating in the Higher Education Panel. Usable returns were received from 434 institutions (83.6 percent).

The population of institutions was classified into 18 strata as shown in Table A1.

Table A1 Stratification Design

Control of Institution	Location of Institution [1]	Type of Institution		
		University	4-Year College	2-Year College
Public	SMSA - Central City	1 [2]	2	3
	SMSA - Fringe Area	4	5	6
	Non-SMSA	7	8	9
Private	SMSA - Central City	10	11	12
	SMSA - Fringe Area	13	14	15
	Non-SMSA	16	17	18

[1] The Census definition of SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) was used to determine the location of each institution.

[2] Stratification cell numbers to be used in defining the components of the reporting categories listed below.

Aggregate data were estimated for the following reporting groups:

	Strata
All institutions:	1 - 18
All universities:	1,4,7,10,13,16
All four-year institutions:	2,5,8,11,14,17
All two-year institutions:	3,6,9,12,15,18
All public institutions:	1 - 9
All private institutions:	10 - 18
All institutions in a SMSA central city:	1-3, 10-12
All institutions in a SMSA fringe area:	4-6, 13-15
All institutions in a non-SMSA area:	7-9, 16-18

The aggregate estimator used was:

$$X' = \sum_{h=1}^{L} \sum_{i=1}^{n'_h} W_h \, X_{hi}$$

Where W_h is a stratum weight, the ratio of the number of institutions in the population to that in the sample for the i^{th} stratum.

X_{hi} is a datum (response to a single questionnaire item) reported by the i^{th} sample institution in the h^{th} stratum.

L is the number of strata defining a reporting category.

n_h' is the number of responding sample institutions in the h^{th} stratum.

No appropriate basis for ratio adjustments to these estimates was available. The stratum weights, W_h are shown in Table A2 with corresponding population and sample counts. In view of the reasonability of these weights, no collapsing of strata was required during the weighting procedures.

Table A2

Sample and Weights Used in Computing National Estimates

All Institutions

Stratification Cell	No. of Institutions In: Sample	Population	Stratum Weight
1. Public universities in a central city	17	59	3.5
2. Public four-year colleges in a central city	14	130	9.3
3. Public two-year colleges in a central city	17	226	13.3
4. Public universities in a fringe area	18	50	2.8
5. Public four-year colleges in a fringe area	81	420	5.2
6. Public two-year colleges in a fringe area	5	85	17.0
7. Public universities in a non-SMSA area	5	17	3.4
8. Public four-year colleges in a non-SMSA area	12	55	4.6
9. Public two-year colleges in a non-SMSA area	7	177	25.3
10. Private universities in a central city	6	13	2.2
11. Private four-year colleges in a central city	62	224	3.6
12. Private two-year colleges in a central city	6	48	8.0
13. Private universities in a fringe area	9	43	4.8
14. Private four-year colleges in a fringe area	33	191	5.8
15. Private two-year colleges in a fringe area	29	411	14.2
16. Private universities in a non-SMSA area	1	4	4.0
17. Private four-year colleges in a non-SMSA area	94	326	3.5
18. Private two-year colleges in a non-SMSA area	18	93	5.2

Appendix B

American Council on Education

Higher Education Panel Survey No. 15

The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities

Do you regard urban involvement as:	For American Higher Education	For Your Institution
a major function	_____	_____
a minor function	_____	_____
an inappropriate function	_____	_____

Please indicate the direction of your institution's urban involvement:	substantial increase	some increase	about the same	decrease
During the past five years	_____	_____	_____	_____
Anticipated during the next five years	_____	_____	_____	_____

****

If your institution has not been involved in urban affairs and you do not anticipate any such involvement, please note the location of your institution in the spaces provided at the end of this questionnaire, and return it in the enclosed envelope.

****

ALL OTHERS PLEASE CONTINUE

Please indicate which of the following statements relating to your institution's urban involvement are currently true or are anticipated in the next five years: (Please check)	currently true	anticipated
Some aspects of the following are specifically related to urban involvement:		
instruction	____	____
student services	____	____
research projects	____	____
community service activities	____	____
Presidential leadership exercised in urban involvement	____	____
A formally structured urban affairs program	____	____
Offer a degree at the undergraduate level in urban affairs	____	____
Offer a degree at the graduate level in urban affairs	____	____
A formal institutional self-study conducted as a basis for urban involvement	____	____
Preparation of an inventory of institution's urban involvement	____	____
Establishment of an urban center or institute	____	____
Establishment of an urban affairs committee	____	____
Establishment of programs which provide credit for internships or other community participation by students	____	____
Institutional funds specifically budgeted for urban involvement	____	____
Cooperative urban programs conducted with other institutions/organizations	____	____
A specifically designated officer coordinating urban activities	____	____
A specifically desginated officer serving as a liason with city officials	____	____
One or more federal grants supporting urban activities	____	____
One or more foundation grants supporting urban activities	____	____
Services to minority students constitute an aspect of urban involvement	____	____

If you have a minority studies program, is it considered primarily an aspect of your urban involvement _____; or of the academic program _____.

Please indicate the severity of each of the possible problems in urban involvement that may have been encountered by your institution:

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	No Problem
Administrative organization			
Availability of competent faculty and staff			
Defining appropriate aspects of urban involvement			
Development of cooperative relations with other institutions			
Development of relations with city agencies			
Faculty acceptance of urban involvement as an institutional objective			
Financial support for urban involvement activities			
Relating to the community or neighborhood			
Lack of institutional incentives for faculty involvement			
Lack of interdisciplinary cooperation			
Lack of information about urban programs at other institutions of higher education			
Lack of information about federal and foundation funding programs			
Politicalization			
Relating to educationally disadvantaged students			
Relating to minority students or minority communities			
Restrictions imposed by size and/or location of the institution			
Other -- please specify:_____			

What aspects of your urban involvement do you consider outstanding?

(1)_____(2)_____(None)_____

How can the American Council on Education be helpful to your institution in its urban involvement? (Mark all that apply)

No help
A widely distributed newsletter covering current urban problems and programs _____
Publication of books, monographs, directories, etc. _____
Conduct research on selected problems _____
Develop relationships with federal agencies _____
Solicit federal and foundation funding for urban programs _____
Develop relationships with state and city governments _____
Consulting services _____
Conferences and workshops _____
Other: Please specify: _____ _____

Would you consider it desirable for the American Council on Education to sponsor several regional conferences designed to clarify the participation of colleges and universities in federally funded urban programs? _____ Is it probable that someone from your institution would attend? _____

Location of institution: Central city: _____ Metropolitan area: _____ Non-urban area: _____